

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION**

ROY KELLNER, )  
Plaintiff, ) Case No. 17-cv-04048  
v. ) Judge: John Z. Lee  
LAKEVIEW LOAN SERVICING, LLC, )  
CENLAR FSB, d/b/a CENTRAL LOAN )  
ADMINISTRATION AND REPORTING, and )  
M&T BANK CORPORATION, et al., )  
Defendants.

**DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO RESTORE  
ITS MOTION TO DISMISS AND FOR LEAVE TO FILE ITS REPLY INSTANTER**

Defendant CENLAR, FSB (“Defendant” or “Cenlar”) by and through its attorneys David M. Schultz and Margaret M. Breeden, and in support of its Unopposed Motion for an Extension of Time to File its Reply in Further Support of its Motion to Dismiss, *Instanter*, states as follows:

1. On May 29, 2017, Plaintiff filed its original Complaint in the instant matter. (*See* Dkt #1). Thereafter, on or about July 26, 2017, Defendant Cenlar filed a Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint (the “Motion”), and Plaintiff subsequently filed its Response. (Dkt. # 29).
2. On September 20, 2017, and one day before Cenlar’s Reply on the Motion was due, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Leave to file its Amended Complaint (Dkt. # 44) which was subsequently granted on September 22, 2017. (Dkt. # 46). Within its Order, the Court dismissed Defendant Cenlar’s pending Motion without prejudice due to the filing of the Amended Complaint. *Id.*

3. Plaintiff's Amended Complaint does not add any new claims, nor substantively amend any factual allegations, as against Defendant Cenlar,<sup>1</sup> and thus has no substantive impact on Defendant Cenlar's Motion nor Plaintiff's Response thereto.

4. Therefore, Defendant Cenlar requests that its July 26, 2017 Motion to Dismiss be restored to the record, along with Plaintiff's Response thereto. Additionally, Defendant requests leave to file its Reply in Further Support of its Motion to Dismiss *instanter*.

5. Counsel for the Plaintiff has no objection to Defendant Cenlar's Motion.

6. Given the early stages of the proceedings, no prejudice will result to Plaintiff nor any other party if Defendant's Motion is granted. Further, restoring Defendant's Motion to Dismiss to the Court's calendar, rather than requiring its re-filing and re-briefing, will conserve the time and resources of the parties and this Court.

WHEREFORE, Defendant Cenlar, FSB respectfully requests that this Court grant its request to restore its Motion to Dismiss to the Court's docket and for leave to file *instanter* its Reply in Further Support of its Motion to Dismiss.

Respectfully submitted,

CENLAR, FSB,  
DEFENDANT

/s/ Margaret M. Breeden

Margaret M. Breeden

David M. Schultz  
Margaret M. Breeden  
Hinshaw & Culbertson LLP  
222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 300  
Chicago, IL 60601-1081  
Tel: 312-704-3000  
Email: mbreeden@hinshawlaw.com

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff voluntarily withdrew its claim of Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress as against Cenlar within its Response to Defendant Cenlar's Motion to Dismiss. (See P's Resp., Dkt # 38, pg. 11).

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on September 28, 2017, I electronically filed with the Clerk of the U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois Eastern Division, the foregoing **Motion to Restore its Motion to Dismiss and for Leave to File its Reply, *Instanter*** by using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing(s) to:

Monique Bene Howery  
Reed Smith LLP  
10 S Wacker Drive  
Suite 4000  
Chicago, IL 60606  
(312) 207-1000  
mhowery@reedsmitth.com

Marc Edward Dann  
The Dann Law Firm Co., LPA  
Po Box 6031040  
Cleveland, OH 44103  
(216) 373-0539  
notices@dannlaw.com

Rusty A. Payton  
Payton Dann  
115 South LaSalle Street  
Suite 2600  
Chicago, IL 60603  
312-702-1000  
payton@paytondann.com

Colette Marie Willer  
Reed Smith, LLP  
10 S. Wacker Dr.  
Chicago, IL 60606  
312-207-1000  
cwiller@reedsmitth.com

Donna J. Taylor-kolis  
The Dann Law Firm Co., LPA  
Po Box 6031040  
Cleveland, OH 44103  
(216) 373-0539  
notices@dannlaw.com

/s/ Margaret M. Breeden